

## REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings and required corrected drawing sheets. Applicant submits replacement drawing sheet herewith.

The Examiner has objected to claim 16 as containing extraneous text. Claim 16 has been amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 24 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1 as non-enabled. In order to make a rejection for nonenablement, the examiner has the initial burden to establish a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Applicant submits that the claims are, in fact, enabled as can be seen from applicant's drawings as originally filed and as shown in the replacement drawing sheet. Applicant's invention is merely an arrangement of mechanical parts that, while novel and unique, is easily understood from the figures and specification. The drawings, while not formal, outline each and every part of the preferred embodiment of the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have no trouble making and using the present invention from the specification and drawings. As such, Applicant submits that his claims are not invalid for lack of enablement.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 through 24 as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. MPEP 2172.01 states that a “claim which omits matter **disclosed to be essential to the invention as described in the specification** or in other statements of record may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not enabling. *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).” (emphasis supplied). “[A]n enablement rejection based on the grounds that a disclosed critical limitation is missing from a claim should be made only when the language of the specification makes it clear that the

limitation is critical for the invention to function as intended.” See MPEP § 2164.08(c). Applicant has not disclosed any of the relationships cited by the Examiner as essential. Therefore, Applicant submits that essential structural cooperative relationships have not been omitted.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 4 and 30 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,000,321 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,787,823. Applicant has cancelled claims 1 to 4 and 30.

Based on the foregoing, the allowance of claims 5-24 is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application on the next Office Action, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the purpose of arranging an interview.

Respectfully submitted,



Nelson D. Nolte, Reg. No. 42,938  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, LC  
12412 Powerscourt Dr. Ste. 200  
St. Louis, Missouri 63131  
Tel: (314) 238-2400  
Fax: (314) 238-2401